



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

(235) CRM-M-8270-2026
DATE OF DECISION:30.04.2026

Sandeep Singh @ SeepaPetitioner

VERSUS

State of PunjabRespondent

CORAM HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA

Present Mr.Davinder Singh, Advocate,
and Mr. M.S.Rai, Advocate, for the petitioner.
Mr. Sandeep Kumar, DAG, Punjab.

SUBHAS MEHLA, J (ORAL)

1. By way of present petition, petitioner seeks concession of regular bail in case bearing FIR No.95 dated 20.06.2025, under Sections 323, 109, 126(2), 117(2), 191(3) and 190 of BNS, 2023, registered at Police Station Urban Estate, District Patiala, Punjab.
2. Brief facts of the case are that the present FIR has been registered on the statement of the complainant Gurpreet Singh against Kulwinder Singh @ Mofar and 12/13 unknown persons, that on 19.06.2025 at about 06:15 PM, while the complainant was present at his office along with his brother Jasveer Singh and acquaintance Ravinder Singh @ Doctor, the said accused along with 12/13 unidentified persons with muffled faces forcibly entered the shop after breaking the glass; that the accused persons, stated to be armed with weapons including an iron rod, double-edged sword and sticks, allegedly attacked the complainant and his companions, causing multiple injuries resulting in fractures, and thereafter all the assailants fled from the spot in their vehicles.



CRM-M-8270-2026

2

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner prays for concession of regular bail to the petitioner on the following grounds:-

- (i) that the petitioner is not named in the FIR;
- (ii) that there is no attribution of injury to the present petitioner;
- (iii) that no injury is attributed on the vital part of the body;
- (iv) that petitioner is in custody for the last ten months;
- (v) that petitioner is having clear and clean antecedents and not involved in any criminal activity and
- (vi) that investigation has already been completed;
- (vii) that trial will take sufficient time to conclude and
- (viii) no useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner behind the bar.

4. In pursuance of advance notice, Mr. Sandeep Kumar, DAG, Punjab, appears and files custody certificate of the petitioner along with copies of MLRs of complainant and injured, same are taken on record. Learned counsel opposes the bail petition on the ground that present petitioner has conducted 'recce' and informed the location of the complainant to the accused and was also a member of unlawful assembly which attacked the shop of the complainant; that as per copies of MLRs, there are total seven injuries to the injured while five to the complainant, however, learned counsel fairly admits that injuries are on non vital party of the body i.e on hand and legs; and that final report has been presented before the Court but charges are yet to be framed against the petitioner.

5. Heard.

6. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case and the contentions raised by learned counsel for the parties, this Court is of considerate opinion that concession of bail cannot be denied just as measure



by the trial Court after appreciating the evidences adduced by both sides and it is a trite principle of criminal jurisprudence that bail is rule, jail is an exception. Accordingly, this Court deems it a fit case to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner on the following aspects:

- i. that main allegation is against co-accused Kulwinder Singh and present petitioner was a member of unlawful assembly which attacked the complainant party;
 - ii. that the petitioner is in custody for the last ten months;
 - iii. that there is no attribution of injury to the petitioner;
 - iv. that no injury is on the vital part of the body;
 - v. that investigation has already been completed;
 - vi. that trial will take sufficient time to conclude;
 - vii. that no fruitful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner behind the bars;
 - viii. that petitioner is having clear and clean antecedents as not involved in any other criminal activity.
8. Therefore, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the instant petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing requisite bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned.
9. It is directed that the petitioner will not tamper with the prosecution evidence and will not directly or indirectly try to contact with the prosecution witnesses, during trial.

30.04.2026	(SUBHAS MEHLA)
mamta	JUDGE
Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No